

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Status

Claims 15 - 30 are pending. Claims 15, 17-25, 27-28 and 30 are amended. Claim 31 is added. Claims 15, 17-25, 27-28 and 30 are amended for clarity. New claim 31 finds support in the specification; pg. 20, lines 5-11. No new matter is believed to have been added. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 15-31 will be active.

Applicants thank Examiner Campanell for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 23 and 25.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 15, 16, 19-22 and 26-30 stand rejected based on 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Kaizik et al '782 in view of Kukes et al, '890. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Primarily, Kazik does not disclose olefin's with 4-6 carbon atoms as starting materials. In its description of the prior art, Kazik discloses stem cracking or catalytic cracking of hydrocarbons *to produce* C4-olefins (isobutene, 1-butene, 2-butenes) and C5-olefins (col. 1, lines 18-25). Kazik *does not* disclose using 4-6 carbon olefin's *as starting materials* for preparing olefins having 8-12 carbon atoms. Therefore, Kazik is deficient both for its failure to disclose olefins with 4-6 carbon atoms as a starting material to produce the desired 8-12 carbon olefins, and for its failure to disclose metathesis of the resulting 1-olefin(s).

In attempt to cure the metathesis deficiency of Kazik, The Examiner relies on Kukes. However, Kukes also fails to disclose olefins with 4-6 carbon atoms as a starting material in

a process to produce 8-12 carbon olefins. Accordingly, Kukes fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kazik, and Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected based on 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Kaizik '782 in view of Kukes, '890 and Gelling, U. S. Patent 6,153,800. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Gelling fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kazik and Kukes with respect to claim 15 as discussed above. Specifically, Gelling fails to disclose olefins with 4-6 carbon atoms as a starting material in a process to produce 8-12 carbon olefins. Accordingly, since claims 17 and 18 are dependent on claim 15, withdrawal of the obviousness ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that all now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objections and rejections and passage of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
Norman F. Oblon



Anne St. Martin
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 65,779

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)